

1 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS
2 Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900
3 Prathima Price, Esq., SBN 321378
4 Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082
5 Mail: 8033 Linda Vista Road, Suite 200
6 San Diego, CA 92111
7 (858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax
8 amandas@potterhandy.com

9
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff

11
12
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15

16
17 **Scott Johnson**

18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 **Fries Properties Inc.**, a California
21 Corporation

22 Defendants.

23
24 **Case No.**

25 **Complaint For Damages And
Injunctive Relief For Violations
Of: Americans With Disabilities
Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act**

26 Plaintiff Scott Johnson complains of Fries Properties Inc., a California
27 Corporation; and alleges as follows:

28
29
30 **PARTIES:**

31 1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. Plaintiff is a
32 level C-5 quadriplegic. He cannot walk and also has significant manual
33 dexterity impairments. He uses a wheelchair for mobility and has a specially
34 equipped van.

35 2. Defendant Fries Properties Inc. owned the real property located at or
36 about 39660 Mission Blvd, Fremont, California, upon which the Mission
37 Stevenson Center operates, in August 2020.

1 3. Defendant Fries Properties Inc. owns the real property located at or
2 about 39660 Mission Blvd, Fremont, California, upon which the Mission
3 Stevenson Center operates, currently.

4 4. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business
5 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their
6 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,
7 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.
8 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein is
9 responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary
10 party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when
11 the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants
12 are ascertained.

13

14 **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

15 5. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28
16 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with
17 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

18 6. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause
19 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of
20 the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights
21 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

22 7. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b) and is
23 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is
24 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

25

26 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

27 8. Plaintiff went to the Mission Stevenson Center in August 2020 with the
28 intention to avail himself of its goods or services motivated in part to

1 determine if the defendants comply with the disability access laws.

2 9. The Mission Stevenson Center is a facility open to the public, a place of
3 public accommodation, and a business establishment.

4 10. Unfortunately, on the date of the plaintiff's visit, the defendants failed
5 to provide wheelchair accessible parking in conformance with the ADA
6 Standards as it relates to wheelchair users like the plaintiff.

7 11. The Mission Stevenson Center provides parking to its customers but
8 fails to provide wheelchair accessible parking.

9 12. Several problems encountered by the plaintiff is that there were slopes
10 in the parking spaces reserved for persons with disabilities that exceeded 2.1%
11 in front of the parking lot. Meanwhile, there was no accessible parking
12 whatsoever in the rear parking lot. Additionally, there were not enough parking
13 spaces marked and reserved for persons with disabilities.

14 13. Plaintiff believes that there are other features of the parking that likely
15 fail to comply with the ADA Standards and seeks to have fully compliant
16 parking available for wheelchair users.

17 14. On information and belief the defendants currently fail to provide
18 wheelchair accessible parking.

19 15. These barriers relate to and impact the plaintiff's disability. Plaintiff
20 personally encountered these barriers.

21 16. As a wheelchair user, the plaintiff benefits from and is entitled to use
22 wheelchair accessible facilities. By failing to provide accessible facilities, the
23 defendants denied the plaintiff full and equal access.

24 17. The failure to provide accessible facilities created difficulty and
25 discomfort for the Plaintiff.

26 18. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable
27 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with
28 disabilities.

1 19. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much
 2 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the
 3 Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact,
 4 these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous
 5 alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of
 6 access if complete removal were not achievable.

7 20. Plaintiff will return to Mission Stevenson Center to avail himself of its
 8 goods or services and to determine compliance with the disability access laws
 9 once it is represented to him that Mission Stevenson Center and its facilities
 10 are accessible. Plaintiff is currently deterred from doing so because of his
 11 knowledge of the existing barriers and his uncertainty about the existence of
 12 yet other barriers on the site. If the barriers are not removed, the plaintiff will
 13 face unlawful and discriminatory barriers again.

14 21. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the barriers and violations
 15 alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are
 16 other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will
 17 amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this
 18 lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that
 19 the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See
 20 *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff
 21 encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his
 22 disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

23

**24 I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS
 25 WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all
 26 Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)**

27 22. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth
 28 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this

1 complaint.

2 23. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the
 3 privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any
 4 place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone
 5 who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C.
 6 § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, *inter alia*, as follows:

- 7 a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices,
 or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford
 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or
 accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the
 accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those
 services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- 8 b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is
 readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are
 defined by reference to the ADA Standards.
- 9 c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the
 maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are
 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities,
 including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the
 maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and
 the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the
 altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals
 with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

10 24. When a business provides parking for its customers, it must provide
 11 accessible parking.

12 25. Here, accessible parking has not been provided in conformance with the
 13 ADA Standards.

14 26. The Safe Harbor provisions of the 2010 Standards are not applicable

1 here because the conditions challenged in this lawsuit do not comply with the
 2 1991 Standards.

3 27. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition
 4 those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily
 5 accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

6 28. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available
 7 and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

8

**9 II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL
 10 RIGHTS ACT (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ.
 11 Code § 51-53.)**

12 29. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth
 13 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this
 14 complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, inter alia,
 15 that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations,
 16 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of
 17 every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal.
 18 Civ. Code § 51(b).

19 30. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the
 20 Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

21 31. Defendants’ acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the
 22 Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff’s
 23 rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities,
 24 privileges, or services offered.

25 32. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty,
 26 discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each
 27 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-
 28 (c).)

33. Although the plaintiff encountered frustration and difficulty by facing discriminatory barriers, even manifesting itself with minor and fleeting physical symptoms, the plaintiff does not value this very modest physical personal injury greater than the amount of the statutory damages.

PRAYER:

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide relief as follows:

1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.

3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52.

Dated: October 23, 2020

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

Bv:

[Signature]

Amanda Seabock, Esq.
Attorney for plaintiff